

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the detailed Office Action and for the Notice of References Cited. In the outstanding Office Action, claims 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over KOENIG (U.S. Patent No. 7,167,855) in view of ANWAR (U.S. Patent No. 6,750,864).

Upon entry of the present amendment, withdrawn claims 1-29 and rejected claims 30-32 will have been cancelled and new claims 33-43 will have been added. Support for the new claims may be found at, for example, page 5, lines 2-6 and 23-29; page 19, lines 12-31; page 33, lines 7-30; page 37, lines 5-11; as well as Figures 3 and 17 of the Application specification as filed. The cancellation of claims 1-32 and the addition of new claims 33-43 should not be considered an indication of Applicants' acquiescence as to the outstanding rejection. Rather, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-32 and added new claims 33-43 to advance prosecution and to obtain an early allowance of the present application. Further, Applicants reserve the right to submit claims based upon the canceled withdrawn claims in another application.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over KOENIG and ANWAR. The cancellation of claims 30-32 is submitted to render the rejection of these claims moot. However, Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection with respect to new claims 33-37. In this regard, KOENIG is directed to matching purveyors of biological consulting services with potential customers. The Examiner asserts column 9, lines 60-66, column 20, lines 17-49 and Figure 10 as teaching a server that transmits ranked information using numeric values of specified information and weightings for specified information to terminal device according to a request from a terminal device, in which the weightings are entered from the terminal device. In this regard, the

asserted portions of KOENIG disclose a query page with a text box for allowing a physician to enter questions about a product. Further, KOENIG discloses that a user specifies what he requires via an interactive question and answer facility and that the interactive question and answer facility is made up of categories and subcategories which may be selected and then ranked according to a level of expertise and priority. Applicants respectfully submit that KOENIG merely discloses a matching process using user-input expert skill levels and priorities as applied to a mathematical formula for determining rank.

According to a non-limiting embodiment of the Applicants' invention as specified in Applicants' independent claim 33, ranked supply information is based on a plurality of ratings and a plurality of weightings related to specified information. Each of the ratings is standardized over supply information by using a standard deviation such that the supply information are rated in terms of each specified information prior to a final ranking process using a total score. Therefore, a ranking result is not affected by specific characteristics (*e.g.*, distributions of specified information) of practical supply information.

Applicants respectfully submit that KOENIG and ANWAR fail to disclose or render obvious a calculator that calculates standard deviations relating to each specified information to determine a plurality of ratings relating to the specified information for each supply information, as recited in Applicants' independent claim 33. Further, Applicants respectfully submit the combination of KOENIG and ANWAR fails to disclose or render obvious a display that *displays a difference* between scores of said information relating to the highest score and other information of said ranked supply information on the results display area of the display of said terminal as a distance from a center of the results display area, the center of the results display area being associated with the

highest score, as recited in Applicants' independent claim 33. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that the asserted portion of KOENIG in column 21, lines 15-37 merely discloses a mathematical formula that takes into account a difference between a provider level and a requester level. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the asserted portion of KOENIG does not disclose or render obvious a difference between scores of said information relating to the highest score and other information of said ranked supply information let alone, a display that displays the claimed difference as a distance from a center of the results display area, the center of the results display area being associated with the highest score. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that KOENIG fails to disclose or render obvious the above-noted feature of Applicants' independent claim 33.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of KOENIG and ANWAR fails to disclose or render obvious a displayer that dynamically displays a change of centered information and changes in distance of said ranked supply information from the center of the results display area in response to changes in the plurality of weightings transmitted from said terminal, as recited in Applicants' independent claim 33. Applicants respectfully submit that, at most, KOENIG discloses a user submitting and resubmitting data, validating permissions against a client profile, and modifying data in an interview questionnaire in the asserted portions of column 10, lines 20-30; column 14, lines 12-26; and column 20, lines 57-65 of KOENIG. It is submitted that KOENIG does not disclose or render obvious that edits and modifications to data and a resubmission of data are dynamically displayed, let alone that a displayer dynamically displays a change of centered information and changes in distance of said ranked supply information from the center of the results display area in response to changes in the plurality of weightings transmitted from said terminal, as

recited in Applicants' independent claim 33.

Applicants' independent claim 33 specifies, *inter alia*, a displayer that displays information having a highest score for said ranked supply information and other information of said ranked supply information on a results display area of a display of said terminal, each of said displayed information being concentrically arranged about said information having the highest score. The Examiner asserts column 10, lines 53-59, column 8, lines 62-67, column 21, lines 50-53, element 1816 of Figure 18 as well as Figure 8 of KOENIG as teaching the above-noted features of Applicants' independent claim 33. In this regard, the asserted portions of KOENIG are submitted to teach, at most, providing matches to a user via an email or a web page and displaying an availability of an expert using a time scale. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the asserted portions do not disclose how ranked supply information is arranged, let alone that each of said displayed information being concentrically arranged about said information having the highest score, as recited in Applicants' independent claim 33.

The Examiner acknowledges that KOENIG fails to teach that data is displayed in a concentric arrangement, but relies on ANWAR to teach this feature. In this regard, ANWAR discloses graphically representing details of a hierarchical tree. In particular, ANWAR discloses variable splitting and that a decision tree may have certain statistical parameters having a value for each node of the decision tree. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of KOENIG and ANWAR set forth by the Examiner fails to disclose or render obvious a displayer that displays information having a highest score of said ranked supply information and other information of said ranked supply information on a results display area of a display of said terminal, each of said displayed information being concentrically arranged about said information having the highest

score, as recited in Applicants' independent claim 33.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 33 is allowable over KOENIG and ANWAR.

In addition, the method of independent claim 34 is submitted to be allowable for reasons similar to those noted with respect to independent claim 33 in addition to reasons related to its own recitations.

Moreover, the computer readable storage medium of independent claim 35 is submitted to be allowable for reasons similar to those noted with respect to independent claim 33 in addition to reasons related to its own recitations.


Applicants respectfully submit that each of dependent claims 36-43 are allowable at least because they depend from independent claims 33, 34 and 35, which Applicants submit have been shown to be allowable. Each of dependent claims 36-43 are also believed to recite further patentable subject matter. As such, allowance of the dependent claims is deemed proper for at least the same reasons noted for the independent claims upon which they depend, in addition to reasons related to their own recitations.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over KOENIG in view of ANWAR is respectfully requested.

At least in view of the herein contained remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the outstanding rejections, together with an indication of the allowability of all pending claims, in due course. Such action is respectfully requested and is believed to be appropriate and proper.

Should there be any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
Tetsuo YAMAGUCHI et al.



William S. Boshnick  
Reg. No. 44,550

May 15, 2009  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, Virginia 20191  
(703) 716-1191

**Steven Wegman**  
**Reg. No. 31,438**